

PROVIDENCE, R.I.  
BULLETIN

CPYRGHT

E. 145,796

APR 13 1965

FOIAb3b

## A fine man is asked to fill the wrong job

President Johnson has picked a right man for the wrong job in naming Vice Admiral William F. Raborn to succeed John A. McCone as director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

If a military man were appropriate for this assignment, the President probably could not have found a better-qualified man than Admiral Raborn, who retired last year after a distinguished career as a fighting sailor and as an administrator in programs that required a high level of intelligence.

Admiral Raborn, who is known here as the skipper of the carrier *Bennington* at the time of her disastrous explosion off Newport in 1954, was the naval officer in charge of the development of the Polaris missile system. In 1961, he was one of three top officers assigned to study antisubmarine warfare. At that time, an official described the three-man team as "the best the Navy has."

The question is not whether the admiral is a good man, however, but whether the training and orientation of a career military man is the kind of preparation most appropriate for the politically sensitive post of CIA director.

Harry H. Ranson, in a study for the Harvard Defense Studies Program, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, wrote a number of years ago that the director of CIA "must be a rare combination of administrative expert, imaginative scholar, courageous master spy, and a person of keen political sensitivity to the political ideals of the American republic . . . a master judge and politician . . ."

Political sensitivity in the broad

sense called for here is not normally a characteristic of men who have dedicated their lives to the necessary, but necessarily confining task of planning for and fighting wars.

It might be argued that since military information is an important target for intelligence operations, a man who has spent most of his life in helping to develop military tactics and hardware should make an ideal CIA chief. But this is to take too narrow a view of the CIA function and to overlook the fact that the United States maintains a large, separate intelligence operation for military purposes. In 1958, at a Senate hearing on Defense Department appropriations, a Pentagon spokesman defended appropriations for a Defense Department intelligence apparatus, saying of the CIA:

"Their mission is a little different . . . They get more into the field of political, economic, etcetera . . ."

It must be conceded that in the fields of political and economic intelligence-gathering and warfare, past civilian directors of the CIA have not always distinguished themselves by their political sensitivity. But this is no reason to turn now to a military man to run the vast, multi-billion dollar "invisible government" with its extensive power to affect and to implement U.S. political action abroad.

The Raborn appointment, if confirmed, increases the need for stronger congressional supervision of CIA activities through a joint committee, as first proposed by Rhode Island's Senator Theodore Francis Green nine years ago.